

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/541,361	07/06/2005	Yoshinobu Sato	37808-0011	3251	
26474	7590 09/26/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
NOVAK DRUCE DELUCA & QUIGG, LLP 1300 EYE STREET NW SUITE 400 EAST TOWER			DELCOTTO, O	DELCOTTO, GREGORY R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			1751		
·			DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006	DATE MAILED: 09/26/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5	5
_	_

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/541,361	SATO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Gregory R. Del Cotto	1751					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 July 2005</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 15-19 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 15-19 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/5/05.	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:	ite					

Art Unit: 1751

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 15-19 are pending. Claims 1-14 have been canceled. The preliminary amendment filed 7/6/05 has been entered.

### **Priority**

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to instant claims 16-19, these claims are all dependent upon claim 1 which has been canceled. For purposes of examination, claims 16-19 have been treated as dependent upon claim 15. Clarification is required.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1751

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 1751

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP11-180836, JP11-323380, JP7-331281, or JP11-323378. Note that, an oral translation was given for each reference at the STIC Library and the Examiner has requested a written translation of each document from the STIC Library.

'836 teaches a cosmetic, compatible with hair when applied containing 0.01 to 10% by weight of N-acylamino acid wherein the acyl chain contains from 8 to 22 carbon atoms, from 0.001 to 10% by weight of a neutral amino acid such as glycine, and as required, a nonionic surfactant. See Abstract. Specifically, '836 teaches compositions having a pH of 5.2.

'281 teaches a detergent composition containing an N-acylglycine or its salt (preferably having an acyl group of a palm kernel oil fatty acid or an acyl group of a

Art Unit: 1751

coconut oil fatty acid) and one or more kinds of substances selected from an amino acid and a saccharide. The pH of the composition is from 6.5 to 9. See Abstract.

'380 teaches a solid detergent composition containing one or more N-acylamino acid salts selected from N-acylglycine, N-acylalanine, and N-acylbeta-alanine and one or more selected from acidic amino acids and salts thereof. See Abstract. The pH of the composition is from 5 to 7. See column 1, lines 10-40.

'378 teaches a solid detergent composition containing at least one anionic surfactant selected from salts of N-acylamino acid, salts of acylisethionic acid, and salts of alkylsulfosuccinic acids; at least one wax; and at least one compound selected from acidic amino acids and salts thereof. The pH of the composition is from 5 to 7. See column 1, lines 20-50.

Note that claim 15 is a product-by process claim; the Examiner asserts that the N-acylamino acid surfactants and amino acid salts contained within the detergent compositions specifically taught by '836, '281, '380, or '378 will mix when used and inherently form the same surfactant as recited by the instant claims. '836, '281, '380, or '378 disclose the claimed invention with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

Note that, even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product n the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See

Art Unit: 1751

MPEP 2113. Once a product appearing to be substantially identical is found a 35 USC 102/103 rejection is made, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious result. See MPEP 2113.

Accordingly, the broad teachings of '836, '281, '380, or '378 anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Alternatively, even if the broad teachings of '836, '281, '380, or '378 are not sufficient to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to formulate a surfactant composition having the same properties as recited by the instant claims because '836, '281, '380, or '378 teach that the types and amounts of components added to the composition may be varied.

#### Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751

GRD September 15, 2006